

**REMARKS**

With entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-15, 21-37 and 55-69 are now pending in this application. Favorable consideration is requested.

At the outset, applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 29 and 37, as set forth on page 7 of the Office Action. In line with this allowability, applicant has added new claims 55-62 (which correspond to original claims 21-29, with the allowable subject matter from claim 29 inserted into claim 21 to form new independent claim 55), and applicant has added new claims 63-69 (which correspond to original claims 30-37, with the allowable subject matter from claim 37 inserted into claim 30 to form new independent claim 63). Thus, these new claim sets 55-62 and 63-69 are allowable and find support in the identified original claims and the corresponding parts of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Also, claims 1 and 9 have been amended as supported by the specification, e.g., Figures 4 and 10 and the corresponding section of the specification. No new matter has been added.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings stand objected because they allegedly do not show every feature of the invention as claimed. The Office Action states that the seal clip 60 in claim 4 in the various shapes is not disclosed in the figures. In response, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this objection for the following reasons. Attention is directed to the various figures of the application, for example, Figures 4, Figure 12, and Figure 17, which support the claim language. In this regard, applicants are not required to disclose every example of a claim feature. The

identified Figures 4, 9, 10, 12 and 13, and the corresponding sections of the specification, support the claims and drawings.

At the top of page 3 of the Office Action, a similar objection is lodged against the specification. In response, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this objection for the following reasons. Again, attention is directed to the various figures, for example, Figures 4, 9, 10, 12 and 13, and the corresponding sections of the specification, which provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,906,364 to Luthi. Applicant requests the withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 9, which require that either the seal clip 60 or the seal member 50 (for example, as seen in Figure 4 of the application) is partially disposed under the leading edge of the corrugated sheet. Luthi does not disclose or suggest these features. In this regard, please see page 6 of the Office Action which correctly states that Luthi "fails to specify the seal clip as being disposed under the leading edge of each corrugated sheet."

Claims 21-28 and claims 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Luthi - the '364 patent in view of Luthi - U.S. Patent 3,837,499. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of these rejections because the two cited references -- in any reasonable combination -- do not render obvious the claimed invention.

As noted on page 6 of the Office Action, Luthi '364 "fails to specify the seal clip as being disposed under the leading edge of each corrugated sheet." However, the Office Action contends that Luthi '499 discloses the concept of disposing a seal clip 72

under and in front of a leading edge of each corrugated sheet 56 and that it would have been obvious to modify the arrangement of the Luthi '364 device so as to have included the seal clip design of the Luthi '499 device. Contrary to the Office Action's positions, the '499 patent describes the number 72 component as a "recess" of a "U-shaped mounting clip 70 that lies on each of the rib elements 30." This is completely different than the claimed seal clip 60.

Furthermore, to modify the two Luthi disclosures in the fashion suggested in the Office Action would defeat the purposes of those two Luthi references and make the devices fail. For example, one skilled in the art would have to split in half the U-shaped mounting clip 70 from the '499 patent (which would render the Luthi '499 device worthless) and would have to add that to the '364 device without any reason for doing so. There is simply no teaching or suggestion or reasonable motivation to do this, and it would go completely against the teaching of the '499 patent.

The same arguments can be made with respect to claims 30-36, e.g., any reasonable combination of the two cited references does not disclose or suggest the claimed "seal clip disposed under and in front of a leading edge of each corrugated sheet...and...a seal member disposed under and/or in front of the leading edge of the corrugated sheet and held in place by the seal clip." Thus, the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by the two cited references and reasonable combination thereof.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If the examiner has any questions concerning this case, the undersigned may be contacted at 703-816-4009.

Todd S. Grace, et al  
Appl. No. 10/830,148  
August 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Duane M. Byers  
Reg. No. 33,363

DMB:lfo  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100